REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 59 to 61, 63 to 120, and 123 are currently pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview of January 4, 2008 between Examiner Meucci and Applicant's representative, Aaron Grunberger (Reg. No. 59,210).

The following is a Statement of Substance of Interview of the telephone interview of August 15, 2007.

During the course of the telephone interview, no exhibit was shown and no demonstration was conducted.

During the course of the telephone interview, Applicant's representative discussed a proposed amendment to independent claim 59 and noted that U.S. Patent No. 6,195,680 ("Goldszmidt") does not disclose or suggest the features of the proposed amended claims.

Examiner Meucci agreed that Goldszmidt does not disclose or suggest all of the features of the proposed amended claim, e.g., the feature of determining which environment to access depending on authorization data provided by an Internet browser in accessing an address on an extranet, and the feature of, responsive to the accessing, creating a new communications session between a communications server and a connection gateway; or an extranet.

The general result or outcome of the telephone interview is that agreement was reached regarding the prior art rejections of the presently pending claims as presented herein.

III. Official Notice and Allegations of Well-Known Fact

The Office Action is replete with statements of official notice and allegations of well-known fact. Applicant respectfully traverses all statements of official notice and allegations of well-known fact and respectfully request published information and/or affidavits under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) to support the statements of official notice and allegations of well-known fact.

IV. Objections to the Claims

The Office Action objects to the claims generally as assertedly including grammatical and other language errors and requests that Applicant correct any such errors which Applicant comes across. Applicant has amended the claims to obviate the present objections. Withdrawal of the objections to the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 59 to 61, 63 to 120, and 123 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 59 to 61, 63 to 120, and 123 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as assertedly indefinite. Claim 59 has been amended herein without prejudice to obviate the present rejection. Withdrawal of this indefiniteness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 59 to 61, 63 to 65, 67, 75, 76, 78 to 80, 82, 88 to 92, 117, 118, and 123 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 59 to 61, 63 to 65, 67, 75, 76, 78 to 80, 82, 88 to 92, 117, 118, and 123 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Goldzsmidt. The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

To reject a claim as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office must demonstrate that each and every claim feature is identically described or contained in a single prior art reference. (*See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). As explained herein, this standard is not met as to all of the features of the claims.

Claim 59, as herein amended without prejudice, relates to a system for remote access of environments and recites an extranet located external to said environments. The Office Action refers to column 7, lines 45 to 52 of Goldzsmidt as assertedly disclosing an extranet. However, an extranet is a network that has properties of a private network and that is overlaid over a public network, such as the Internet. The cited section of Goldzsmidt refers to the Internet and does not disclose, or even suggest, an extranet.

Further, claim 59 recites that, responsive to accessing a predetermined address by an Internet browser on the extranet, in which accessing the Internet browser provides authorization data, a communications server located in the extranet determines which environment the authorization data indicates to access, and creates a new communications session between the communication server and one of a plurality of connection gateways, the connection gateway being located in the determined environment.

During the interview of January 4, 2008, Examiner Meucci, referring to figure 6 of Goldzsmidt, clarified that the Office Action intends to rely on clients 620 as assertedly disclosing the Internet browser, manager 640 as assertedly disclosing the communications server, the combination of the sources 630 and reflectors 610 as assertedly disclosing the environment, and the reflectors 610 as assertedly disclosing the connection gateway.

However, Goldzsmidt refers to an arrangement of content servers managed by a manger 640 for providing the content of the servers to requesting clients 620, such that when connections between the client 620 and one of the servers, *i.e*, a source 630, fails another server can continue to provide the content to the requesting client.

As explained by Applicant, and as agreed to by the Examiner, during the interview of January 4, 2008, Goldzsmidt is completely unrelated to a system where a determination of an environment or connection gateway to which a communications server is to connect is made by the communications server. For example, in response to a client 620 accessing the manager 640, the manager 640 merely assigns a primary and secondary source to the requesting client 620. The manager 640 does not make any determination of which one of a plurality of environments the client 620 is authorized to access based on authorization data provided by the client 620, for communicating with a corresponding reflector 610. Therefore, Goldzsmidt does not identically disclose, or even suggest, "responsive to accessing a predetermined address by said Internet browser on said extranet, in which accessing said Internet browser provides authorization data, one of said at least one communications server subsequently: determines which one of said environments said authorization data indicates authority to access . . .," as provided for in the context of claim 59.

Furthermore, Goldzsmidt refers to a server system where the manager 640 is in constant communication with the sources 630 and reflectors 620, e.g., for monitoring their load. The elements 620/630 and 640 are not indicated to be in different networks and there is no discussion of creating a new communications session between the elements 620/630 and 640. Indeed, nowhere does Goldzsmidt disclose, or even suggest, that, responsive to accessing an address of a network in which the manager 640 is located, the manager 640 creates a new communications session between the manager 640 and any of the reflectors 610. Instead, at most, Goldzsmidt refers to assignment of a reflector 610 to the client 620. Thus, Goldzsmidt does not identically disclose, or even suggest, "responsive to accessing a predetermined address by said Internet browser on said extranet, . . . one of said at least one communications server subsequently: . . . creates a new communications session between

said communications server and one of said connection gateways," as provided for in the context of claim 59.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Goldzsmidt does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 59, so that Goldzsmidt does not anticipate claim 59 or any of its dependent claims, e.g., claims 60, 61, 63 to 65, 67, 75, 76, 78 to 80, 82, 88 to 92, 117, 118, and 123.

As further regards claim 60, the claim has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that "the connection gateway located in said environment is adapted to serve, in said communications session, a user interface for the control of the operation of the at least one service in accordance with operation instructions input via said Internet browser." Goldzsmidt, on the other hand, provides for connection of a client 620 to a server system 610/630/640 in order to receive content from sources 630. The clients 620 do not provide instructions in accordance with which to control operation of a service in an environment that includes the sources 630 and reflectors 610, and certainly not where the reflectors 610 serve a user interface for such control. Thus, Goldzsmidt does not disclose, or even suggest, a connection gateway adapted to serve a user interface for control of operation of at least one service in accordance with operation instructions input via an Internet browser, as provided for in the context of claim 60.

For this additional reason, Goldzsmidt does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 60, so that Goldzsmidt does not anticipate claim 60 for this additional reason.

Withdrawal of this anticipation rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claims 66, 68, 73, 74, 83, 85, 86, and 103 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 66, 68, 73, 74, 83, 85, 86, and 103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt and Official Notice. The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claims 66, 68, 73, 74, 83, 85, 86, and 103 ultimately depend from claim 59 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 since the Official Notice does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to Goldzsmidt. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (any dependent claim that depends from a non-obvious independent claim is non-obvious).

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 69 to 71, 84, 106, 107, and 119 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 69 to 71, 84, 106, 107, and 119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt and U.S. Patent No. 5,784,463 ("Chen"). The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claims 69 to 71, 84, 106, 107, and 119 ultimately depend from claim 59 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 since Chen does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to 69 to 71, 84, 106, 107, and 119. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

IX. Rejection of Claim 72 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 72 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt and U.S. Patent No. 5,948,059 ("Woo"). The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claim 72 depends from claim 59 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 since Woo does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to Goldzsmidt. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

X. Rejection of Claim 77 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 77 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt and U.S. Patent No. 5,668,929 ("Foster, Jr."). The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claim 77 ultimately depends from claim 59 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 since Foster, Jr. does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to Goldzsmidt. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

XI. Rejection of Claim 108 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 108 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt, Chen, and Foster, Jr. The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claim 108 depends from claim 107 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 107 since Foster, Jr. does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to the combination of Goldzsmidt and Chen. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

XII. Rejection of Claim 81 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 81 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt and U.S. Patent No. 6,216,173 ("Jones"). The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claim 81 ultimately depends from claim 59 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 since Jones does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to Goldzsmidt. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

XIII. Rejection of Claim 87 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 87 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt and U.S. Patent No. 6,032,202 ("Lea"). The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claim 87 depends from claim 59 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 since Lea does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to Goldzsmidt. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

XIV. Rejection of Claims 93, 94, 96 to 102, 104, 105, 109 to 116, and 120 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 93, 94, 96 to 102, 104, 105, 109 to 116, and 120 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt and European Patent Application Publication No. 0 838 768 ("Venkatraman"). The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claims 93, 94, 96 to 102, 104, 105, 109 to 116, and 120 ultimately depend from claim 59 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 since Venkatraman does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to Goldzsmidt. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

XV. Rejection of Claim 95 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 95 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Goldzsmidt, Venkatraman, and U.S. Patent No. 5,991,881 ("Conklin"). The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claim 95 ultimately depends from claim 59 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 since the combination of Venkatraman and Conklin does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to Goldzsmidt. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

XVI. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: January 14, 2008

By: /Aaron Grunberger/
Aaron Grunberger
Reg. No. 59,210

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO 26646